



Massachusetts Department of Correction

Quarterly Report on the Status of Prison Overcrowding, Second Quarter of 1995

Submitted in Compliance with Chapter 799
Section 21 of the Acts of 1985

Larry E. DuBois
Commissioner

September 1995

Approved by: State Purchasing Agent
Publication no : 14,602-09-45-10-10-86

1995 Second Quarter Report

Section Twenty-one of Chapter 799 of the Acts of 1985 directs the Commissioner of Correction to report quarterly on the status of overcrowding in the state and county facilities. This statute calls for the following information;

Such report shall include, by facility, the average daily census for the period of the report and the actual census on the second and last days of the report period. Said report shall also contain such information for the previous twelve months and a comparison to the rated capacity of such facility.

This report presents the required statistics for the second quarter of 1995.

This report was prepared by Ramon V. Raagas of Research & Planning and is based on daily count sheets prepared by the Classification Division. Table 5 is based on Admission and Release rosters submitted by the institutions.

Technical Notes

- The official capacity or custody level designation for each facility can change for a number of reasons, e.g. expansion of facility beds, decrease of facility beds due to fire, or changes in contracts with vendors. In all tables the capacity and custody level reflects the status at the end of the reporting period. The design capacity is reported for correctional facilities in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.

- On January 31, 1995, the design capacity for the Departmental Segregation Units (DSU) at MCI-Cedar Junction and MCI-Norfolk were taken off the count sheets. The segregation units are considered support beds and are not shown on the daily count sheet as design capacity. This resulted in the elimination of 72 beds from the previous quarterly reports.

- In previous quarterly reports, the population figures for PPREP were included with the Park Drive population. The PPREP population is reported independently starting with the first quarter of 1995.

- The population figures for all facilities include both male and female inmates except as shown at Lancaster.

- State inmates housed in the Hampshire county contract program are included in the county population tables as are all other state inmates housed in county facilities.

- Longwood Treatment Center is a specialized DOC facility for individuals incarcerated for O.U.I. Because the inmates are primarily county sentenced inmates, the inmate count and bed capacity are also included in Tables 3 and 4.

- Pondville Correctional Center is a minimum/pre-release security facility formerly known as Norfolk Pre-Release Center.

- The Massachusetts Boot Camp opened on August 17, 1992, and is located at the Bridgewater Correctional complex in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. Prior to 1993, the Boot Camp had been listed as a DOC minimum security facility. Beginning with the first quarter of 1993, the Boot Camp is listed along with Bridgewater SH, AC, TC and Longwood TC in Tables 1 and 2. As with Longwood, most of the Boot Camp inmates are from the county houses of correction, so the Boot Camp is also listed with the county facilities in Tables 3 and 4.

- Norfolk County includes Braintree, Dedham, and Norfolk Contract. Middlesex County includes both Billerica and Cambridge. Berkshire County includes the pre-release facility. Suffolk County-South Bay includes the contract facility. Essex County includes Middleton, and Lawrence Alternative Center. Bristol County includes Dartmouth, Eastern Mass. Alternative Center and Pre-Release

- Nashua Street inmates housed at other facilities are reported in the counts for the facilities in which they were in custody.

- On June, 1993, Plymouth House of Correction added 833 beds making a total of 1,140 beds

- On April 18, 1995, new security level changes have been made to 103 DOC 101 Correctional Institutions/Custody Levels policy.

Custody Levels:

- **Level One.** The least restrictive in the department and is reserved only for those inmates who are at the end of their sentence and have been identified as posing little to no threat to the community. Supervision is minimal and indirect

- Level Two.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate maximum responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions prior to their release. Direct supervision of these inmates is not required, but intermittent observation may be appropriate under certain conditions. Inmates within this level may be permitted to access the community unescorted to participate in programming to include, but not limited to, work release, educational release, etc.

Custody Levels (cont'd.)

- **Level Three.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of returning to the inmate a greater sense of personal responsibility and autonomy while still providing for supervision and monitoring of behavior and activity. Inmates within this security level are not considered a serious risk to the safety of staff, inmates or to the public. Program participation is mandated and geared toward their potential reintegration into the community. Access to the community is limited and under constant direct staff supervision.

- **Level Four.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate some degree of responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions, while still insuring the safety of staff and inmates. Design/construction is generally characterized by high security parameters and limited use of internal physical barriers. Inmates at this level have demonstrated the ability to abide by rules and regulations and require intermittent supervision. However, behavior in the community, i.e., criminal sentence and/or the presence of serious outstanding legal matters indicate the need for some control and for segregation from the community. Job and program opportunities exist for all inmates within the perimeter of the facility.

- **Level Five.** A custody level in which design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates. Inmates accorded to this status may present an escape risk or pose a threat to other inmates, staff, or the orderly running of the institution, however, at a lesser degree than those at level 6. Supervision remains constant and direct. Through an inmates willingness to comply with institutional rules and regulations, increased job and program opportunities exist.

- **Level Six.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates primarily through the use of high security parameters and extensive use of internal physical barriers and check points. Inmates accorded this status present serious escape risks or pose serious threats to themselves, to other inmates, to staff, or the orderly running of the institution. Supervision of inmates is direct and constant. Inmates are confined to their cells at all times, except when they are removed for authorized activities. Inmates within their status, when removed from their cell, are typically under escort and in restraints.

Abbreviations

AC	- Addiction Center	OCC	- Old Colony Correctional Center
ADP	- Average Daily Population	OUI	- Operating Under the Influence
ATU	- Awaiting Trial Unit	PPREP	- Pre-Parole Residential Environmental Phase Program
CRS	- Contract Residential Services. Includes Charlotte House, and Houston House	PRC	- Pre-Release Center
DDU	- Departmental Disciplinary Unit	SECC	- Southeastern Correctional Center
DSU	- Departmental Segregation Unit	SDPTC	- Sexually Dangerous Person Treatment Center
DRC	- Day Reporting Center	SMCC	- South Middlesex Correctional Center (formerly SMPRC)
Drug Rehab	- Includes Meridian House, Treatment Center and Spectrum House	SH	- State Hospital
LCAC	- Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center.	TC	- Treatment Center (Longwood)
NECC	- Northeastern Correctional Center	WSATP	- Women's Substance Abuse Treatment Program. Includes Faith House and Griffin House
NCCI	- North Central Correctional Institution at Gardner		

Table 1 provides the DOC figures for the second quarter of 1995. As this table indicates, the DOC population (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, Mass. Boot Camp) increased by 30 inmates during the second quarter. At the end of the quarter, the DOC operated with 9,798 inmates in the system, and the average daily population was 9,730 with a design capacity of 6,437. Thus, the DOC operated at 151 percent of design capacity.

**Population in Department of Correction Facilities,
April 3, 1995 to June 30, 1995**

Custody Level/ Facility	Average Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	711	714	714	633	112%
Framingham - ATU	107	92	112	64	167%
Custody Level 5					
OSCC	744	728	748	488	152%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,439	1,411	1,442	514	280%
Framingham	462	478	451	388	119%
Norfolk	1,335	1,337	1,336	988	135%
Bay State	302	296	296	266	114%
NCCI	1,016	1,014	1,014	568	179%
SECC	758	754	773	356	213%
Shirley-Medium	1,075	1,086	1,103	720	149%
Sub-Total	7,949	7,910	7,989	4,985	159%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	170	177	185	151	113%
NECC	247	259	252	150	165%
SECC-Minimum	166	173	159	200	83%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	190	203	179	94	202%
Lancaster-Female	67	69	78	59	114%
Pondville	187	195	197	100	187%
Shirley-Lower	368	399	366	403	91%
SMCC	164	163	166	125	131%
Sub-Total	1,559	1,638	1,582	1,282	122%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	99	96	100	55	180%
Park Drive	48	44	49	50	96%
Hodder House	23	30	28	35	66%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	14	12	15	15	93%
Houston House	10	10	9	15	67%
PREPP	28	28	26	n a.	n a
Sub-Total	222	220	227	170	131%
Total	9,730	9,768	9,798	6,437	151%
Bridgewater SH	332	324	332	337	99%
Bridgewater SDPTC	209	209	208	216	97%
Bridgewater AC	172	170	163	430	40%
Longwood TC	143	151	142	125	114%
Mass. Boot Camp	130	118	104	256	51%
Sub-Total	986	972	949	1,348	72%
Grand Total	10,716	10,740	10,747	7,785	137%
Houses of Correction	918	918	894	n a	n a
Federal Prisons	28	28	30	n a	n a
Inter-State Contract	69	69	80	n a	n a

Table 2 provides the DOC figures for the previous twelve months - i.e., for the period April 1, 1994 to March 31, 1995. These figures indicate that the DOC population increased by 114 over this twelve-month period (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, Mass. Boot Camp), from 9,684 in April, 1994 to 9,798 in March 1995.

**Population in Department of Correction Facilities,
April 1, 1994 to March 31, 1995**

Facility	Average Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Cedar Junction	809	827	719	693	117%
Concord	1,319	1,254	1,409	514	257%
Framingham - ATU	97	80	121	64	152%
Framingham	440	388	456	388	113%
Norfolk	1,313	1,303	1,337	1,019	129%
Bay State	268	265	296	266	101%
NCCI	1,005	1,006	1,015	568	177%
OCCC	717	717	727	488	147%
SECC	725	723	757	356	204%
Shirley-Medium	1,090	1,082	1,094	720	151%
Sub-Total	7,783	7,645	7,931	5,076	153%
NECC	255	263	258	150	170%
SECC-Minimum	189	208	177	200	95%
Lancaster-Male	202	205	203	94	215%
Lancaster-Female	72	81	70	59	122%
Plymouth	200	233	179	151	132%
Pondville	198	197	195	100	198%
Shirley-Lower	409	424	400	403	101%
SMCC	176	197	163	125	141%
Hodder House	27	26	30	35	77%
Boston State	90	98	94	55	164%
Park Drive	57	81	44	50	115%
Charlotte	13	13	14	15	87%
Houston House	9	13	11	15	60%
PPREP	6	0	29	n.a	n.a
Sub-Total	1,903	2,039	1,867	1,452	131%
Total	9,686	9,684	9,798	6,528	148%
Bridgewater SH	311	306	325	337	92%
Bridgewater SDPTC	212	216	209	212	100%
Bridgewater AC	184	200	179	430	43%
Longwood TC	143	161	152	125	114%
Mass. Boot Camp	116	144	120	256	45%
Sub-Total	966	1,027	985	1,360	71%
Grand Total	10,652	10,711	10,783	7,888	135%
Houses of Correction	904	625	925	n.a	n.a
Federal Prisons	28	30	28	n.a	n.a
Inter-State Contract	67	65	69	n.a	n.a

Table 3 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 1995. The county population decreased by 17 inmates during this quarter. At the end of the quarter, the county system operated with 10,946 inmates, and the average daily population was 10,960 in facilities with a total design capacity of 8,241. Thus, the county system operated at 133 percent of design capacity.

**Population in County Correctional Facilities,
April 3, 1995 to June 30, 1995**

Facility	Average Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	285	276	287	110	259%
Berkshire	221	239	225	116	191%
Bristol	1,041	1,013	1,041	666	156%
Dukes	22	20	24	19	116%
Essex	1,214	1,170	1,219	635	191%
Franklin	127	130	138	63	202%
Hampden	1,460	1,466	1,413	1,178	124%
Hampden-OUI	141	260	127	125	113%
Hampshire	246	233	247	248	99%
Middlesex	1,285	1,267	1,302	792	162%
Norfolk	556	555	555	379	147%
Plymouth	1,059	1,045	1,041	1,140	93%
Suffolk-Nashua St	506	515	514	453	112%
Suffolk-So. Bay	1,467	1,441	1,471	1,146	128%
Worcester	1,057	1,064	1,076	790	134%
Longwood TC	143	151	142	125	114%
Mass. Boot Camp	130	118	104	256	51%
Total	10,960	10,963	10,946	8,241	133%

Table 4 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. These figures indicate that the county population increased by 1,144 inmates or 10 percent over this twelve-month period, from 9,780 in April, 1994 to 10,924 in March, 1995.

**Population in County Correctional Facilities,
April 1, 1994 to March 31, 1995.**

Facility	Average Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	235	187	285	110	214%
Berkshire	215	230	246	116	185%
Bristol	997	990	1,021	666	150%
Dukes	18	19	20	19	95%
Essex	1,137	1,176	1,187	635	179%
Franklin	118	125	128	63	187%
Hampden	1,388	1,325	1,473	1,178	118%
Hampden-OUI	122	128	132	125	98%
Hampshire	253	266	231	248	102%
Middlesex	1,165	1,139	1,282	792	147%
Norfolk	551	493	558	379	145%
Plymouth	875	549	1,053	1,140	77%
Suffolk-Nashua St	482	475	528	453	106%
Suffolk-So Bay	1,350	1,286	1,440	1,146	118%
Worcester	1,001	1,087	1,068	790	127%
Longwood TC	143	161	152	125	114%
Mass. Boot Camp	116	144	120	256	45%
Total	10,166	9,780	10,924	8,241	123%

Table 5 provides statistics on court commitments to the DOC in 1994 and 1995. Overall, there has been an increase of 381, or 24 percent, in commitments for the first two quarters of 1995 in comparison with the number of commitments in 1994, from 1,610 to 1,991. Commitments to Cedar Junction for the second quarter of 1995 decreased by 4 when compared to the 1994 figure. Overall, male commitments for 1995 increased by 65, or 6 percent from 1994. Commitments to Framingham during 1995 increased by 316, or 68 percent compared to the number of commitments during the same period of 1994.

Court Commitments to the DOC			
	1994	1995	Difference
MCI-Cedar Junction			
First Quarter	497	620	25%
Second Quarter	570	566	0%
MCI-Concord			
First Quarter	39	16	-57%
Second Quarter	42	11	-72%
Total Males	1,148	1,213	6%
MCI-Framingham			
First Quarter	201	367	83%
Second Quarter	261	411	57%
Total Females	462	778	68%
Grand Total	1,610	1,991	24%

Figure 1 provides a graphical representation of the number of court commitments to the DOC committing institutions during the second quarter of 1994 and the second quarter of 1995.

